



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

fru
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/827,558	04/19/2004	Leonard S. Schultz	6749.05	3428
7590	12/12/2006			EXAMINER PATEL, SHEFALI D
David E. Bruhn, Esq. DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP Intellectual Property Department Suite 1500, 50 South Sixth Street Minneapolis, MN 55402-1498			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/827,558	SCHULTZ, LEONARD S.
	Examiner Shefali D. Patel	Art Unit 2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 43-58 and 75-83 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 43-58 and 75-83 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on October 19, 2006 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. The amendment filed on October 19, 2006 has been entered.
3. Objection/Rejection made to claim 43 has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to reference by Palmer have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection (Cullen et al).
5. Applicant's arguments filed on October 19, 2006 (Remarks on pages 12-17) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicants argue with respect to the reference by Prokoski with an argument that Prokoski fails to remedy the deficiencies of Palmer. Also, that the Palmer and Prokoski fails to teach or suggest the invention in combination. This argument is also moot in view of new ground of rejection (Cullen et al. in view of Prokoski).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claims 43-45, 47, 49-51, 53-54, 75-79 and 81-81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being rejected by Cullen et al. (hereinafter, "Cullen") (US 6,397,213).

With regard to **claim 43** Cullen discloses a device for providing a text related to an image (Figure 2A and its respective portions in the specification), comprising: a microprocessor (col. 3 line 27); a library of stored images (database 222); and a library of stored texts (database 222), wherein each of stored texts is associated with at least one of the stored images (col. 3 lines 49 to col. 4 lines 1-65 where the image is divided in the zones representing image portion and/or text portions. The text is associated with that image by having the caption or the header col. 4 lines 1-6); wherein, upon receipt of a new image, the microprocessor compares the new image to the stored images and, associated with the new image the stored text associated with the one of the stored images that is most similar to the new image (col. 7 line 55 to col. 8 lines 1-45 where for the document searching process a new image comes in and those zones are matched, associated, with the zones previously searched. Once the match is found the stored zone is associated with the new one).

With regard to **claim 44** Cullen discloses the new image, stored images and stored texts are being digital (as seen in Figures 1 and 2A the images/texts are scanned and stored as digital).

With regard to **claim 45** Cullen discloses the microprocessor uses digital image recognition to identify the one of the stored images that is most similar to the new image (col. 3 lines 24-39).

Claim 47 recites identical features as claim 43 except claim 47 is a device claim and Cullen discloses the device in Figures 1 and 2A. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 43 is equally applicable to claim 47.

Claim 49 recites identical features as claim 45. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 45 is equally applicable to claim 49.

With regard to **claim 50** Cullen discloses real-time images of the new image as seen in Figures 1 and 2A.

Claim 51 recites identical features as claim 43. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 43 is equally applicable to claim 51.

Claim 53 recites identical features as claim 44. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 44 is equally applicable to claim 53.

With regard to **claim 54** Cullen discloses means for communicating the images and texts (network interface 144, col. 3 line 33).

Claim 75 recites identical features as claim 43. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 43 is equally applicable to claim 75.

Claims 76 and 77 recites identical features as claim 44. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 44 is equally applicable to claims 76 and 77.

With regard to **claim 78** Cullen discloses selecting an image and the library of text by using a microprocessor as seen in Figure 1 at col. 3 lines 25-39.

Claim 79 recites identical features as claim 45. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 45 is equally applicable to claim 79.

Claim 81 recites identical features as claim 43. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 43 is equally applicable to claim 81.

Claim 82 recites identical features as claim 44. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 44 is equally applicable to claim 82.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 46, 48, 55-58, 80 and 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cullen in view of Prokoski (US 6,529,617).

With regard to **claim 56** Cullen discloses all of the features as disclosed above in claim 43 and the arguments are not repeated herein, but are incorporated by reference. Cullen does not expressly disclose the records (or images and texts) being medical records. Prokoski discloses medical images and such throughout the invention, specifically as seen in Figure 14. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Prokoski with Cullen. The motivation for doing so is to use medical images specifically rather than images of documents broadly as used in Cullen. The documents in Cullen can be any medical image that can be scanned into the system to have available both image and the related texts (for example, x-ray image with patient's name and time stamp, or an ultrasound image of a fetus with details of the fetus on it). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Prokoski with Cullen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 56.

With regard to **claim 57** Prokoski captures, processes and creates plurality of images as seen in Figure 14.

With regard to **claim 58** Prokoski discloses the library digital images signals and text descriptions comprising an electronically accessible database as seen in Figure 18 and its respective portions in the specification.

With regard to **claim 46** Prokoski discloses when no stored image is similar to the new image, the microprocessor generates a signal to indicate that no match has been identified for the new image (col. 16 lines 34-47).

With regard to **claim 48** Prokoski discloses the procedure a surgical procedure and the past procedures are past surgical procedures (col. 21 lines 41-50, col. 23 lines 55-57).

With regard to **claim 55** Prokoski discloses as seen in Figure 14 the images depicts aspects of medical procedures.

Art Unit: 2624

Claim 80 recites identical features as claim 55. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 55 is equally applicable to claim 80.

Claim 83 recites identical features as claim 46. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 46 is equally applicable to claim 83.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shefali D. Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-7396. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00am - 5:00pm (First Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on (571) 272-7429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JINGGE WU
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Shefali D Patel
Examiner
Art Unit-2624

sdp